

## OPINION 1700

### *Laeocochlis* Dunker & Metzger, 1874 (Mollusca, Gastropoda): conserved as the correct spelling

#### Ruling

(1) Under the plenary powers it is hereby ruled that *Laiiochochlis*, *Laeochochlis* and *Laiocochlis* are incorrect spellings of *Laeocochlis* Dunker & Metzger, 1874.

(2) The name *Laeocochlis* Dunker & Metzger, 1874 (gender: feminine), type species by monotypy *Laiiochochlis* [sic] *pommeraniae* Dunker & Metzger, 1874 (a junior subjective synonym of *Cerithium sinistratum* Nyst, 1835), is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology.

(3) The name *sinistratum* Nyst, 1835, as published in the binomen *Cerithium sinistratum* (senior subjective synonym of the specific name of *Laiiochochlis* [sic] *pommeraniae* Dunker & Metzger, 1874, the type species of *Laeocochlis* Dunker & Metzger, 1874), and as defined by the neotype designated by Glibert (1958), is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

(4) The names *Laiiochochlis*, *Laeochochlis* and *Laiocochlis*, all with the authorship Dunker & Metzger, 1874, are hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology (incorrect spellings of *Laeocochlis* Dunker & Metzger, 1874).

#### History of Case 2769

An application for the conservation of *Laeocochlis* Dunker & Metzger, 1874 as the correct spelling of the generic name was received from Mr David Heppell (*National Museums of Scotland, Edinburgh, U.K.*) on 6 April 1990. After correspondence the case was published in BZN 48: 27–30 (March 1991). Notice of the case was sent to appropriate journals.

A comment from Drs Philippe Bouchet (*Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris, France*) and Anders Warén (*Naturhistoriska Riksmuseet, Stockholm, Sweden*), published in BZN 48: 322–323 (December 1991), pointed out that the specific name of *Cerithium sinistratum* Nyst, 1835 was that valid for the type species of the genus (*L. pommeraniae* Dunker & Metzger, 1874), and that *sinistratum* was defined by the neotype designated by Glibert (1958). They noted that both the spellings *Laiiochochlis* and *Laiocochlis* had had usage and considered that conservation of *Laiocochlis* would best serve nomenclatural stability.

A reply by Mr Heppell, published in BZN 49: 70 (March 1992), considered that the Commission should be asked first to rule that *Laiiochochlis* and *Laeochochlis* were incorrect spellings, and then to determine the correct spelling of the generic name (*Laeocochlis* or *Laiocochlis*) by a simple majority. The latter spellings had appeared in the same publication (Dunker & Metzger, 1874b).

The suppression of the earliest spelling *Laiiochochlis* Dunker & Metzger, 1874a, which had had little use, had been advocated both by Heppell (BZN 48: 27–30; 49: 70) and by Bouchet & Warén (BZN 48: 322–323). This was given on the voting papers as Proposal A. Proposals B and C differed only in the choice between the two spellings *Laeocochlis* and *Laiocochlis*, both of Dunker & Metzger, 1874b (the third

spelling therein, *Laeochochlis*, had not been used). Proposal B was that of Heppell (BZN 48: 28–29 with amendments; BZN 49: 70), Proposal C that of Bouchet & Warén (BZN 48: 322–323).

### Decision of the Commission

On 1 September 1992 the members of the Commission were invited to vote. At the close of the voting period on 1 December 1992 the votes were as follows:

Proposal A. Affirmative votes — 26: Bayer, Bock, Bouchet, Cocks, Cogger, Corliss, Dupuis, Halvorsen, Holthuis, Kabata, Kraus, Lehtinen, Macpherson, Mahnert, Martins de Souza, Minelli, Nye, Ride, Savage, Schuster, Starobogatov, Štys, Thompson, Trjapitzin, Uéno, Willink

Negative votes — 2: Hahn and Nielsen.

Proposal B — 14: Bayer, Bock, Cogger, Corliss, Halvorsen, Kabata, Kraus, Mahnert, Martins de Souza, Minelli, Savage, Thompson, Uéno and Willink.

Proposal C — 11: Bouchet, Dupuis, Hahn, Holthuis, Lehtinen, Macpherson, Nye, Ride, Schuster, Štys and Trjapitzin.

No vote was received from Heppell. Cocks and Starobogatov voted for Proposal A but abstained from voting for either B or C. Hahn voted against Proposal A but preferred C rather than B.

Štys commented that, all other things being equal, he preferred *Laiocochlis* over *Laeocochlis* since the former spelling was used for the type genus of the family-group LAIOCOCHLIINAE Golikov & Starobogatov, 1987 (para. 4 of the application).

### Original references

The following are the original references to the names placed on Official Lists and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

*Laeochochlis* Dunker & Metzger, 1874, *Jahrbücher der Deutschen Malakozoologischen Gesellschaft*, 1(2): 146 (an incorrect spelling of *Laeocochlis*).

*Laiocochlis* Dunker & Metzger, 1874, *Nachrichtenblatt der Deutschen Malakozoologischen Gesellschaft*, 6(1): 7 (an incorrect original spelling of *Laeocochlis*).

*Laeocochlis* Dunker & Metzger, 1874, *Nachrichtenblatt der Deutschen Malakozoologischen Gesellschaft*, 6(1): 7 (incorrectly spelled as *Laiocochlis*).

*Laiocochlis* Dunker & Metzger, 1874, *Jahrbücher der Deutschen Malakozoologischen Gesellschaft*, 1(2): pl. 7, fig. 3 (an incorrect spelling of *Laeocochlis*).

*sinistratum*, Cerithium, Nyst, 1835, *Recherches sur les coquilles fossiles de la province d'Anvers*, p. 28.

The following is the reference for the designation of the neotype of *Cerithium sinistratum* Nyst, 1835:

Glibert, M. 1958. *Bulletin de l'Institut Royal des Sciences Naturelles de Belgique*, 34(15): 10.